

E-004789



CALFED  
BAY-DELTA  
PROGRAM

1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155  
Sacramento, California 95814

(916) 657-2666  
FAX (916) 654-9780

## Memorandum

Date: January 28, 1999

To: CALFED Policy Group

From: Lester A. Snow  
Executive Director

*Reviewed  
for LAS*

Subject: CALFED Program Overview and Schedule

### Summary

The release of the Revised Phase II Report last December provided a framework for proceeding with development and refinement of the Preferred Program Alternative. The report represented significant achievement on behalf of the state and federal agencies and representatives of urban, agriculture, environmental, business, rural and Delta stakeholders. While there is more work to be done in 1999, the report represents substantial agreement in many areas of the CALFED Program.

Since the December release of the Phase II Report, CALFED has conducted five public workshops in January throughout the state (San Jose, Visalia, Lodi, Red Bluff, and San Diego). The purpose of the workshops was to describe the Preferred Program Alternative, the status of the CALFED Program and the next steps the Program will undertake in 1999 to complete its work.

Preferred Program Alternative. The attached diagram shows describes the makeup of both the Preferred Program Alternative (PPA) and the Record of Decision (ROD) which should be viewed as the same (see attachment 1). Remember that we are at the draft Preferred Program Alternative stage so it is likely that the PPA/ROD which is presented in the attachment would look different when the final documents are prepared.

Attachment 1 is provided for discussion purposes and each of the items will be expanded upon when the PPA is described in the Programmatic EIS/EIR. The PPA/ROD are made up of the eight Program elements; the Water Quality, Water Use Efficiency, Water Transfer, Watershed, Ecosystem Restoration and Levee Programs as defined in each of the

---

#### CALFED Agencies

##### California

The Resources Agency  
Department of Fish and Game  
Department of Water Resources  
California Environmental Protection Agency  
State Water Resources Control Board

##### Federal

Environmental Protection Agency  
Department of the Interior  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries Service

Program Plans, storage up to 6 maf and a through-Delta conveyance facility. The PPA/ROD also includes a plan for implementing these elements including regulatory agreements. The reason these features are separated into different boxes is simply to acknowledge that the consequences of the long-term programmatic actions (of the eight elements) are by necessity described generally in the Programmatic EIS/EIR and that any specific actions stemming from the implementation plan will need to be examined in much greater detail as the Program is refined in the next phase. Attachment 2 describes the Drinking Water Quality Conveyance Strategy as it relates to the Programmatic EIS/R and the project specific EIS/R's that would be need to be done subsequently.

EIS/R Schedule. The critical work efforts in 1999 and the process to complete those work efforts are described in the next agenda item. However, a key issue to resolve before completing the 1999 workplan is the proposed schedule for the Revised Draft EIS/R. CALFED proposes the release of a Public Draft in June 1999, a Public Final in April 2000 and an ROD in June 2000 (Attachment 3). A June 1999 Public Draft allows sufficient additional time to develop the Program before the next public release and maintains the momentum of the Program.

A June 1999 Public Draft results in a release of an Administrative Draft in April 1999 which allows very little time for the program managers to augment their Program Plans accordingly. Therefore we plan to provide only the impact analysis document for agency review. This approach allows the program managers to work on their Program Plans for the Public Draft rather than spending their time preparing a report for agency review and then turning around and preparing one for the public. In addition, the Program Plans have recently been updated to reflect the changes in the Revised Phase II Report and will be distributed in February for review by the Agencies. The program managers would continue to work closely with all agencies to ensure familiarity and agreement with information in the Program Plans.

**Action: Concurrence Item**

The Policy Group is being asked for concurrence on the proposed schedule for the EIS/R.

Attachments